IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

WRIT PETITION NO : 808 of 1995

Between:

1 A. Sridhar S/o A. Mallaiah Chetty
H.No.D/340, Srisailam Dam East,
Kurnool Dist., A.P.
2 N. Nagamani D/o N. Veeraiah
R/o Srisailam Dam East,
Kurnool Dist., A.P.
3 D. Chennaiah S/o D. Samson
H.No.D/348, Srisailam Dam East,
Kurnool Dist., A.P.

..... PETITIONER(S)

AND

1 The Member Secretary, APSEB, Vidyuth Soudha,
Khairatabad, Hyderabad, A.P.
2 Superintending Engineer Operation & Maintanance Circle, APSEB,
Srisailam East, Kurnool Dist., A.P.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ or order or direction under article 226 of the Constitution of India, particularly one in the nature of Writ of "Certiorari" quashing the Memo issued by the 2nd respondent herein in Memo No.SE/O&M/SLMP/ADM/C.1/FJTC/D.No.45/95 dt: 10-1-1995 as unjust and illegal after calling for the records and to pass such other orders that this Hon'ble Court may deem just and proper.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.PRATTIPATI VENKATESWARLU

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.Samineni Kishore, Standing Counsel for APSEB

The Court made the following :

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioners herein question the Memo dated 10-1-1995 issued by the 2nd respondent wherein it was decided to terminate the contracts entered into for the purpose of execution of work and that the Electricity Board would not provide employment to those employed in that work.

The petitioners relied on an interlocutory order of this Court in W.P.M.P.Nos.20564 of 1992, and 5393 to 5397 of 1993 and WVMP 228 of 1994 in W.P.No.16211 of 1992 and sought for similar relief. In terms of the said order dated 30-9-1994, the interim order was to be in force till the disposal of I.D.No.78 of 1992 or till the disposal of the writ petition whichever was earlier.

This Court by order in W.P.No.16211/92 dated 3-4-2002 dismissed the writ petition as infructuous. It is represented by the learned counsel for the petitioner that subsequently I.D.No.78/92 had also been dismissed.

This writ petition is also accordingly dismissed. No costs.

_____

7-7-2005

asp

To:

1 The Member Secretary, APSEB, Vidyuth Soudha,
Khairatabad, Hyderabad, A.P.
2 Superintending Engineer Operation & Maintanance Circle, APSEB,
Srisailam East, Kurnool Dist., A.P.

3. Two C.D. copies